

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. Claim 2 has been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-11 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Examiner Objections

On Page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 4, 9 and 11 due to informalities. The Applicant has corrected the informalities as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, the withdrawal of the objection to claims 4, 9, and 11 is respectfully requested.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

On Page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kallio, et al. (US 2004/0157629), hereinafter referred to as Kallio. The Applicant has amended the claims to better distinguish the claimed invention from Kallio. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested. In addition, claim 2 has been canceled.

The Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 11. Claim 1 now recites that the gateway performs the complete media control protocol transactions with the monitoring terminal based upon the received parameters and maps protocols utilized in the first multimedia call to protocols used in the second multimedia call. Claim 1 incorporates the limitations of claim 2. In addition, support for the amendments is found on page 2, lines 31-35 and page 6, lines 27-32 of the Applicant's specification.

Kallio discloses a method and system for intercepting connections based on internet-protocol-type connections (i.e., VOIP calls). In Kallio, the interception is handled by the SGSN and/or GGSN in a network. The SGSN and/or GGSN then links with a Lawful Interception Gateway (LIG) during the interception phase. The LIG then

creates reports for the Law Enforcement Agency (LEA) of the interception (see paragraph 0068 of Kallio).

In contrast, the Applicant's invention provides a method of performing lawful interception of a multimedia call. A gateway emulates a multimedia terminal at the gateway and sets up a second multimedia call between the emulated terminal and a monitoring terminal. The gateway performs the complete media control protocol transactions with the monitoring terminal based upon the received parameters. In addition, the gateway maps protocols utilized in the first multimedia call to protocols used in the second multimedia call with the monitoring terminal. The Applicant's invention provides a method and apparatus for intercepting multimedia calls and allows the use of normal multimedia equipment (e.g., mobile handsets) without the requirement of specialized equipment for intercepting the multimedia call.

Kallio does not disclose intercepting a multimedia call. Kallio only discloses intercepting an internet-protocol-type call (see paragraph 0007 of Kallio). In addition, Kallio does not disclose creating an emulated terminal at the gateway or setting up a multimedia call between an emulated terminal and a monitoring terminal. Kallio merely discloses establishing a connection between the SGSN and/or GGSN and the LIG (see paragraph 0050 of Kallio).

Furthermore, the Examiner stated that Kallio discloses emulating a multimedia terminal at the gateway and setting up a multimedia call between the gateway and a monitoring terminal wherein the properties of this call are negotiated in dependence of the received parameters. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Applicant's invention is directed to establishing a multimedia call between the monitoring terminal and the gateway to negate the requirement for specialized equipment at the monitoring terminal. The Applicant's invention, therefore, sets up a multimedia call with the monitoring terminal to allow the interception without requiring the monitoring terminal to use equipment compatible with the intercepted multimedia call. Kallio merely discloses setting up a connection between the SGSN and GGSN and the LIG. Kallio does not provide any additional information on the connection between these nodes. Furthermore, the LIG does not set up any multimedia call with the LEA.

Additionally, the Examiner stated in the rejection of claim 2, that Kallio discloses that the gateway performs a mapping between protocols used in the network connecting the terminals involved in the call being intercepted to protocols used in the network connecting the gateway to the monitoring terminal. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Kallio does not provide any disclosure of this mapping function in either the cited passages by the Examiner or anywhere in Kallio.

Kallio does not disclose a method of performing a lawful interception of a multimedia call. In addition, Kallio does not disclose a gateway which emulates a multimedia terminal at the gateway or sets up a second multimedia call between the emulated terminal and a monitoring terminal. Kallio also does not disclose that the gateway performs the complete media control protocol transactions with the monitoring terminal based upon the received parameters or that the gateway maps protocols utilized in the first multimedia call to protocols used in the second multimedia call with the monitoring terminal. Therefore, Kallio does not anticipate the Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, independent claim 11 includes limitations analogous to claim 1 and also is not anticipated by Kallio. Claims 3, 4, 6, and 8 depend from amended claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Therefore, the allowance of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, and 11 is respectfully requested.

4.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On Page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kallio as applied to claim 1 in view of Armbruster, et al. (US 5892811), hereinafter referred to as Armbruster. The Applicant has amended claim 1 to better distinguish the claimed invention from Kallio and Armbruster. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claim is respectfully requested.

Kallio does not disclose intercepting a multimedia call, establishing a gateway which emulates a multimedia terminal at the gateway or setting up a second multimedia call between the emulated terminal and a monitoring terminal. Additionally, Kallio also does not disclose that the gateway performs the complete media control protocol transactions with the monitoring terminal based upon the received parameters or that

the gateway maps protocols utilized in the first multimedia call to protocols used in the second multimedia call with the monitoring terminal. The addition of Armbruster does not make up the missing elements.

Therefore, the combination of Kallio and Armbruster does not teach or suggest the Applicant's invention as recited in claim 1. Claim 5 depends from amended claim 1 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Therefore, the allowance of claim 5 is respectfully requested.

On Page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kallio as applied to claim 1 in view of Hoffberg, et al. (US 2002/0151992), hereinafter referred to as Hoffberg. The Applicant has amended claim 1 to better distinguish the claimed invention from Kallio and Hoffberg. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claim is respectfully requested.

As stated above, Kallio does not disclose all the elements as recited in claim 1 of the Applicant's invention. The addition of Hoffberg does not make up the missing elements. Therefore, the combination of Kallio and Hoffberg does not teach or suggest the Applicant's invention. Claim 9 depends from amended claim 1 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Therefore, the allowance of claim 9 is respectfully requested.

On Page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kallio as applied to claim 1 in view of Kung, et al. (US 6373817), hereinafter referred to as Kung. The Applicant has amended claim 1 to better distinguish the claimed invention from Kallio and Kung. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claim is respectfully requested.

Kallio does not disclose all the elements as recited in claim 1 of the Applicant's invention. The addition of Kung does not make up the missing elements. Therefore, the combination of Kallio and Kung does not teach or suggest the Applicant's invention. Claim 10 depends from amended claim 1 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Therefore, the allowance of claim 10 is respectfully requested.

5.) Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1 and 3-11.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven W. Smith
Registration No. 36,684

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-1572
steve.xl.smith@ericsson.com